

REMARKS

Claims 11-14 are rejected under U.S. Code 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite to particularly pointing out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Examiner has taken exception with claims 11 and 14 as they use the phrase “deeply embossed” and “improved thermal insulation.” Examiner contends it is unclear as to the range of embossing that is defined as “deeply embossed” or the degree of insulation that is defined by “improved thermal insulation”.

Applicant has amended claim 11 deleting “deeply” in front of the word “embossed.” In this same claim, Applicant does not see any reason to amend the phrase “improved thermal insulation” as the phrasing of the claim makes it clear that the improvement is relative to an unembossed sheet. There is no ambiguity or indefiniteness. The embossed sheet provides improved thermal insulation. Claim 14 has similarly been amended to delete “deeply” and to retain “improved.”

Claims 1-2, 5-17, 19, 21-23 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Albrecht, U.S. Patent 4,875,242. The Examiner states that Albrecht teaches a disposable sanitary seat cover that has a detachable inner oval section (54) that provides an opening to the toilet.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 adding the limitation that the annulus has a polygonal perimeter and an oval inner edge, and deleting the element “a wipe that is a detachable inner oval section.” In the Albrecht invention the Examiner has incorrectly identified element 54 as a detachable inner oval section. In column 4, line 50-56, Albrecht describes his flap as a protectant flap (54) securely attached to the forward end of the opening (18), with the cut line (19) being interrupted sufficiently to tack the protective flap (54) in place until detached from the cut-line by the user, thus expanding the opening (18) and permitting the flap (54) to hang down into the bowl (56) of the toilet. It is apparent that in contrast to the Albrecht disposable sanitary toilet seat cover, the annulus has no flap that is designed to hang down into the toilet. This is in contrast to the Applicant’s toilet seat

cover, which is an annulus with an ovalled inner edge. No portion of the Applicant's toilet seat cover can hang down into the toilet at any time. Claim 1 and claim 25 have been amended to clearly distinguish the invention over Albrecht.

Claims 1-19, 21-23 and 25-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S. Code 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albrecht in view of MacLean. MacLean discloses a toilet seat cover comprising a paper sheet coated with a synthetic plastic such as polyethylene. The Examiner contends it would have been obvious to combine MacLean and Albrecht. The Examiner also contends that MacLean cites in Canadian patent 315,162 in column 3, line 49 that the use of odorous or fragrant seat covers is well known and conventional in the art.

Applicant teaches in claims 18 and 37 that the absorbent layer is fragranced. The Canadian patent referenced by the Examiner teaches that the seat protectors can include a plurality of odorous sanitized packets, column 3, line 50. In the MacLean invention there is a longitudinal slit (112), as shown in Figures 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14 and 15. The Applicant presumes the slit is pressed open therein forming a toilet seat cover where the walls are folded or fall into the bowl of the toilet. This is similar to Albrecht, except that the *sides* of the cover are pushed in, rather than the *front* of the toilet seat cover. In Applicant's invention, no portion of the seat cover enters the toilet bowl, and the center is totally detachable and is suitable as a wipe. A user cannot use the center of either Albrecht or MacLean's invention as a wipe because it will be in the toilet bowl, and would not qualify as sanitary.

The Examiner has rejected claims 20 and 39 as being unpatentable over Albrecht in view of MacLean and Tanaka, U.S. Patent 6,663,949. The Examiner points out that Tanaka teaches the use of an absorbent sheet, which contains water swellable polymeric particles. Tanaka references column 3, lines 5 and 14, and Tanaka also teaches the use of a deodorizer.

Applicant notes that Tanaka in column 3, line 5 teaches a polymer that swells and gets tacky. Applicant does not teach, nor desires a tacky toilet seat cover. Applicant does not claim the use of a deodorizer. A deodorizer is a substance that masks or neutralizes

odors. A fragrance is a substance, such as perfume or cologne that is designed to emit a pleasant odor. Tanaka's patent reads on applications such as sanitary napkins where a deodorizer would be appropriate. Applicant's invention is not intended to deodorize a bathroom or a toilet, but to merely emit a pleasant odor.

Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S. Code 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albrecht in view of Knisely, U.S. Patent 1,835,787. Knisely discloses a sanitary closet seat cover (3) made of crepe tissue paper, which is absorbent and is treated with an antiseptic. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use Knisely's teaching of using tissue absorbent paper with an antiseptic treatment in the invention.

Applicant notes that Knisely, similar to Albrecht, teaches a toilet seat cover where the central portion remains attached and folds down into the toilet seat bowl, and the centerpiece is identified as flap 5, and upon flushing is automatically pulled down with the contents of the bowl, column 2, lines 80-83. The antiseptic that is present in the centerpiece could not serve usefully as an antiseptic in a wipe since the center portion of Knisely's invention is in the bowl of the toilet. Additionally, Knisely teaches away from a water-impervious layer. In line 74, Knisely teaches that moisture causes the toilet seat cover to remain in place. Applicant's invention eliminates contact with moisture and provides a sanitary wipe.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitation of having a polygonal perimeter and an ovalled inner edge. The ovalled inner edge was previously claimed in claim 6 without proper antecedent basis, and the polygonal perimeter was claimed in claim 5. Claim 5 is now canceled. Independent claim 25 has been amended to include the limitations of the polygonal perimeter and an ovalled inner edge. Claim 29, now amended, defines the polygonal perimeter as rectangular, and claim 30, now amended, had previously introduced the limitation of the ovalled inner edge of the annulus. Claim 25 additionally has been amended to include the limitations wherein the adhesive fastening means is covered by a siliconized release liner. Support for the siliconized release liner can be found on page 12,

line 17 of the specification. Claim 31 has been amended to further characterize the adhesive fastening means as a double-coated pressure sensitive adhesive tape having a filmic carrier and a siliconized release liner. Support for this amendment is found on page 17, lines 16 and 17 of the specification. Claim 6 and claim 30 have been amended to include the limitation that the wipe is fully detachable from the toilet seat cover. In contrast to Albrecht, MacLean, and Knisely, wherein the center section remains attached to the toilet set cover, in Applicant's invention the center is fully detachable and therefore suitable as a sanitary wipe. Claims 30 and 6 have been amended, explicitly pointing out that the wipe is fully detachable.

In summary, the amended claims clearly distinguish the instant invention from the 102 and the 103 cited prior art, and it is believed that the amended claims, in view of the arguments set forth, should be allowed as they overcome each of the Examiner's rejections.

There are no new claims, and therefore no additional fees. There is no new subject matter, and all amendments are fully supported by the specification. The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "F. R. Brockington", with a stylized flourish at the end.

F. Rhett Brockington
Patent Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 29,618
DOUGHERTY, CLEMENTS, HOFER & BERNARD
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211
Telephone: 704/366-6642
Facsimile: 704/366-9744

Attorney's Docket 3756